

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/719,228	11/21/2003	Jonathan M. Rourke	702563.4010	3176	
34313 , 75	590 09/22/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE, LLP			O CONNOR, CARY E		
4 PARK PLAZ SUITE 1600	A		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
IRVINE, CA	92614-2558		3732	3732	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			KT
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	19
	10/719,228	ROURKE ET AL	\bigvee
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Cary E. O'Connor	3732	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appeariod for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence addre	ess
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1. after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a rep - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statut - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin - earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be till by within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) da will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e. cause the application to become ABANDON	mely filed ys will be considered timely. n the mailing date of this comr ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nunication.
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 N	lovember 2003.		
<u> </u>	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for alloware closed in accordance with the practice under a			nerits is
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o			
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.		
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		Examiner.	
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se	ee 37 CFR 1.85(a).	
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ction is required if the drawing(s) is o	bjected to. See 37 CFR	1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	xaminer. Note the attached Office	e Action or form PTO	-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Burea	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica prity documents have been receiv	tion No	age
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	t of the certified copies not receiv	ed.	
Attachment(s)			
1) X Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) 🔲 Interview Summar Paper No(s)/Mail [
 Notice of Dratisperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-946) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>112104</u>. 	<u></u>	Patent Application (PTO-1	52)

Application/Control Number:

10/719,228 Art Unit: 3732

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being anticipated by Jayaraman (5,895,407). Jayaraman shows a prosthesis structure for support a wall of a body passage comprising a generally tubular body having a contracted condition and biased to an enlarged condition (stent 70 is self-expandable). The body includes a plurality of openings defining a micro-porous mesh pattern therein (see abstract).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Omum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claim 1 rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,676,701. Although

Application/Control Number:

10/719,228 Art Unit: 3732

the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it has been held that "[o]mission of an element and its function where not needed is obvious." Ex parte Rainu, 168 USPQ 168, USPQ 375 (PTO Bd. Of App. 1969).

Claim 1 is rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,312,463. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because it has been held that "[o]mission of an element and its function where not needed is obvious." Ex parte Rainu, 168 USPQ 168, USPQ 375 (PTO Bd. Of App. 1969).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cary E. O'Connor whose telephone number is 703-308-2701. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 7:00-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kevin Shaver can be reached on 703-308-2582. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

10/719,228 Art Unit: 3732

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Cary/E. O'Connor Primary Examiner Art Unit 3732

ceo September 17, 2004